

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 111

March 22, 1995, 2:41 p.m.
Page S-4323 Temp. Record

LINE-ITEM VETO/Entitlement-Tax Legislation & the Deficit

SUBJECT: Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 1995 . . . S. 4. Coats motion to table the Hollings amendment No. 404 to the Dole substitute amendment No. 347.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 52-46

SYNOPSIS: Pertinent votes on this legislation include Nos. 109-110 and 112-115.

As reported, S. 4, the Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 1995, will grant the President enhanced power to rescind spending in appropriations bills, and direct (generally entitlement) spending bills. Rescissions would remain in effect unless Congress passed a disapproval resolution and, if necessary, overrode a presidential veto by the usual two-thirds margin in both Houses.

The Dole substitute amendment would replace the provisions of S. 4 with provisions that would mandate the separate enrollment as bills of line items in all spending bills, in all bills containing new or expanded direct spending programs, and in all bills containing targeted tax benefits.

The Hollings amendment would amend the Budget Act by applying to budget resolutions the current 10-year pay-as-you-go point of order against considering direct-spending or receipts legislation that would increase the deficit.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Coats moved to table the Hollings amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

The goal of this amendment is laudable. However, it is not germane to the issue at hand. The debate on S. 4 is on whether the President should be given the line-item veto power, and if so, in what form. It has nothing to do with internal Senate rules on the consideration of budget resolutions. The Budget Committee already rejected an identical amendment by the Senator from South Carolina during its consideration of this bill, but it did not reject the concept. In fact, the Chairman of the Budget Committee has promised to hold hearings on the Hollings amendment. We agree with this approach. We favor the motion to table, but our votes are

(See other side)

YEAS (52)			NAYS (46)			NOT VOTING (2)	
Republicans (51 or 96%)	Democrats (1 or 2%)		Republicans (2 or 4%)	Democrats (44 or 98%)		Republicans (1)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Helms	Feinstein	Campbell	Akaka	Johnston	Shelby- ²	Heflin- ²
Ashcroft	Hutchison		Jeffords	Baucus	Kennedy		
Bennett	Inhofe			Biden	Kerrey		
Bond	Kassebaum			Bingaman	Kerry		
Brown	Kempthorne			Boxer	Kohl		
Burns	Kyl			Bradley	Lautenberg		
Chafee	Lott			Breaux	Leahy		
Coats	Lugar			Bryan	Levin		
Cochran	Mack			Bumpers	Lieberman		
Cohen	McCain			Byrd	Mikulski		
Coverdell	McConnell			Conrad	Moseley-Braun		
Craig	Murkowski			Daschle	Moynihan		
D'Amato	Nickles			Dodd	Murray		
DeWine	Packwood			Dorgan	Nunn		
Dole	Pressler			Exon	Pell		
Domenici	Roth			Feingold	Pryor		
Faircloth	Santorum			Ford	Reid		
Frist	Simpson			Glenn	Robb		
Gorton	Smith			Graham	Rockefeller		
Gramm	Snowe			Harkin	Sarbanes		
Grams	Specter			Hollings	Simon		
Grassley	Stevens			Inouye	Wellstone		
Gregg	Thomas						
Hatch	Thompson						
Hatfield	Thurmond						
	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

without prejudice; our objections are solely procedural.

Those opposing the motion to tabled contended:

The Hollings amendment is about truth in budgeting on budget resolutions. At present, every committee in the Senate except the Budget Committee has to operate under the 10-year pay-as-you-go rule. Senators may soon regret this exemption. While we favor many elements of the Contract with America, we oppose others because they will prove to be very costly over the long-term. If the Contract with America is fully implemented it will cost \$188 billion in its first 5 years. However, in the second 5 years it will cost an additional \$450 billion. Most of these expensive elements are likely to be considered on the budget resolution in just a few weeks. Without the Hollings amendment, there will be no consideration of these costs in the second 5 years. For example, the Republicans' capital gains tax cut proposal will cost \$28.4 billion in the first 5 years, but will post a revenue loss of \$91.9 billion over the next 5 years.

The arguments raised against this amendment are that S. 4 is an inappropriate vehicle to which to attach it and that we should wait for the Budget Committee to act. On the first point, if the parliamentarian were to have to rule, he would find that this amendment is germane because the underlying bill also will amend the Budget Act. On the second point, we do not have time to wait. The budget resolution that is likely to make these short-sighted promises in the Contract with America will be on the floor in a few weeks. If we wait to try and pass the Hollings amendment then, it will be subject to a 60-vote point of order under the Byrd rule. Therefore, the time is right, and the cause is right, so this amendment should not be tabled.